

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

19

Application Number	10/663,419
Filing Date	09/16/2003
First Named Inventor	SACKS, Abraham
Art Unit	3635
Examiner Name	HORTON, Yvonne Michele

Attorney Docket Number

050601

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- Fee Transmittal Form
 Fee Attached
 Amendment/Reply
 After Final
 Affidavits/declaration(s)
 Extension of Time Request
 Express Abandonment Request
 Information Disclosure Statement
 Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
 Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
 Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

- Drawing(s)
 Licensing-related Papers
 Petition
 Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
 Power of Attorney, Revocation
 Change of Correspondence Address
 Terminal Disclaimer
 Request for Refund
 CD, Number of CD(s) _____
 Landscape Table on CD

- After Allowance Communication to TC
 Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
 Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
 Proprietary Information
 Status Letter
 Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

Remarks

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name

Signature

Printed name

George S. Levy, Patent Agent

Date

12/04/2006

Reg. No. 53211

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

George S. Levy, Patent Agent

Date 12/04/2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Title: IMPROVED TWIN TRACK WIRE LATH
Application No.: 10/663,419
Filing Date: 09/16/2003
Inventor: SACKS, Abraham et al.
Group Art Unit: 3635
Examiner: HORTON, Yvonne Michele
Attorney Docket No: 050601
Date: 11/10/2006

To: Commissioner for Patents, USPTO
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Dear Examiner Horton:

Please note that a telephone interview was conducted on 10/13/2006. The examiner's written report is quoted below:

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: During this interview, it was established that the 35 U.S.C. 132(a) rejection of new matter was in error. The applicant's attorney submitted tentative amendments that the examiner felt would not place the claims in condition for allowance. She did; however, suggest that any further amendments to the claims should focus more on the fact that there is no longitudinal strand disposed on or in the crest of the fur. Although this suggestion was made, the applicant's representative was informed that a detailed updated search would need to be performed, accordingly. The applicant's representative suggested submitting an affidavit regarding shipment of the device, the examiner expressed that a review thereof would also have to be performed in order to give a more definitive reply.

We agree with the examiner's assessment that the 35 USC 132(a) rejection was in error. We do not agree with the examiner that a new search is necessary since the original claims were clear in stating that the spacing furs are situated between longitudinal strands. This topic has been on the examiner's desk through four office actions, the filing of an appeal and the subsequent reopening of the prosecution by the examiner. At this point, it is unreasonable for her to claim she needs a new search regarding this point. More discussion on this subject will be presented below in response to the office action of 09/05/2006.

We also remind the examiner that a petition to make special on the basis of age is in the records.